

### REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over "Microsoft Office 97" (Moseley, et al.) in view of "Cascading Style Sheets in Internet Explorer 4" (Young). Claim 14 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite. The Examiner objected to Claims 4, 8, 12 and 13 as being dependent upon rejected base claims, and indicated that these claims would be allowable if appropriately rewritten.

Applicants herein ask that the claims be amended to place the application in condition without further argument or amendments.

Specifically, Applicants herein ask that independent Claims 1, 5 and 9 be amended to include the limitations of claims 4, 8 and 12, respectively. This is the equivalent of rewriting claims 4, 8 and 12 in independent form including all of the limitations of Claims 1, 5 and 9 respectively, and places Claims 1, 5 and 9 in condition for allowance. Claims 4, 8 and 12 themselves are being cancelled.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants request that the Examiner enter these amendments to Claims 1, 5 and 9, reconsider and withdraw the rejections of these Claims under 35 U.S.C. §103, and allow Claims 1, 5 and 9.

Claims 2 and 3 are dependent from, and are allowable with, Claim 1; and, similarly, Claims 6 and 7 are dependent from Claim 5 and are allowable therewith. In addition, claims 10 and 11 are dependent from Claim 9 and are allowable therewith. The Examiner is, accordingly, also asked to reconsider and to withdraw the rejections of Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103, and to allow these claims.

Applicants also request that Claim 13 be rewritten in independent form including the limitations of previous Claims 1 and 2, from which Claim 13 depended. This places Claim 13 in condition for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to enter this amendment to Claim 13, to reconsider and to withdraw the objection to this Claim, and to allow Claim 13.

Claim 14 is, similar to Claim 13, being rewritten in independent from including all of the limitations of previous claims 1 and 2, from which Claim 14 depended. Applicants further ask that Claim 14 be amended to address the rejection of the claim under 35 U.S.C. §112.

More specifically, in the office Action, the Examiner noted that Claim 14 was written in two sentences, and thus rejected the claim under 35 U.S.C. §112. Applicants ask that the claim be amended herein to correct this, and in particular, to change "section name. The" to "section name, the". This does not raise any new issues and does not require any further searching by the Examiner. Moreover, this change overcomes the rejection of the claim under 35 U.S.C. §112, and the Examiner is, accordingly, asked to enter this amendment to Claim 14, and to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of the claim under 35 U.S.C. §112.

With respect to the rejection of Claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103, Applicants note that Claim 14 includes the same limitations described in Claim 13 and thus likewise patentably distinguishes over the prior art. Specifically, claim 14 describes the feature that the web page is part of one of said sections, and the altering step includes the step of using the identified section name to indicate automatically on the web page the name of the section of which the web page is part. Accordingly, the Examiner is asked to enter these changes to Claim 14, to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of the Claim under 35 U.S.C. §103, and to allow the claim.

For the reasons set forth above, the Examiner is asked to enter this Amendment, and to reconsider and to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103. The Examiner is further requested to reconsider and to withdraw the objection to Claim 13, and the rejection of Claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §112, and to allow Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11, 13 and 14. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' Attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is asked to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

*John S. Sensny*  
John S. Sensny  
Registration No. 28,757  
Attorney for Applicant

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser  
400 Garden City Plaza  
Garden City, New York 11530

JSS:jy